

ATTACHMENT

POSITION PAPER ON TECHNICAL PANEL EXCHANGE

In general the numbers listed below are keyed to the numbers set forth in Annex C to the JCS Revision, document DCS/5 B.

1. The JCS suggests addition of Poland and Czechoslovakia to the countries to be inspected on the ground that the proposed five nations would afford an advantage to the USSR over the Allies from an intelligence standpoint. This warrants careful consideration and it is suggested that the intelligence to be gained by the USSR in the four "western countries" is far outweighed by the intelligence to be gained by an inspection in Russia proper. One of the unique features of the inspection proposal is that the United States stands to gain far more than it would lose by an inspection in view of the paucity of information available currently from within the boundaries of Russia.

2. We do not object to this change but see no necessity since the composition is covered in Annex B. Further, the original wording is repeated in paragraph II A. 1. of the original position paper as well as in the JCS Revision.

3. Concur.

4. Again it occurs to us that on the theory of net gain to the United States, photography from the ground is a highly desirable feature. Therefore, the JCS suggestion should be carefully considered before deletion of ground photography.

5. Believe immaterial but have no objection to JCS changes. Immediately following their insert are the words "the data" which should read "the data".

6. The JCS suggests limitation of inspection to one each of the various categories rather than the suggested two on the grounds that this should suffice for a test inspection. If it is true that the United States has more to gain by inspection than does the USSR, we see no reason at this stage to limit inspection to one rather than two. Believe this warrants further consideration.

7. We must defer to the Atomic Energy experts on this one.

8. Concur.

Note: In the JCS position paper there are two footnotes labeled 8, one occurring in the latter part of the Abstract and the other occurring in item 4 of the Terms of Reference. We would concur in both suggestions for change.

9. Concur.

Item 7 of the Terms of Reference in the JCS paper refers to agreements whereas the original position paper refers to arrangements. We have a slight preference for the original.

In I. A. 1., there is a parenthetical statement "with the exception of item 8" obviously referring to item 8 of the Abstract and item 3 h. of paragraph I. A. For clarity this should be corrected.

9a. Same as 4.

10. Same as 3.

11. Concur.

"Objects of control" in I. A. 3. should read "objects of inspection". They are so referred to in Annex B, paragraph 2 B.

12. Same as 6 with respect to two installations versus one; otherwise concur that the JCS description is more accurate and really spells out two different types of Army installations.

13. Same as 7.

14. Agree with JCS insertion of the word "and". Believe insertion of "its members" is unnecessary and inconsistent with paragraph 2 of Annex B of both the original and JCS Revision.

15. Concur.

The title to Annex A "Identification of Objects of Control" should properly be "Objects of Inspection". See comment above after item 11.

16. Same as 6.

The first sentence of item 1. states that inspection will "be limited to". Suggest consideration to insert "include" in lieu of "be limited to". in order to assure coverage. On balance the positive statement seems to accomplish more of the purpose than the negative limitation. If adopted, the title should also be adjusted.

17. Concur.

18. Concur.

19. Concur.

20. Concur.

21. Concur.

22. Same as 6.

23. Same as 6.

24. Same as 6; concur in the restatement of the types of air bases.

25. Concur.

26. Same as 17.

27. Same as 18.

28. Concur.

29. It is suggested that if the net gain concept is applicable in operational units, it would be equally applicable with respect to "sensitive" training equipment. Therefore, would suggest retention of original wording. Nonconcurrence with JCS suggestion.

Item 5 m. Both variations refer to external examination of aircraft. In consideration of principles of net gain to the United States in the intelligence field, why not suggest internal examination of aircraft.

30. Same as 6.

31. It would appear that this information would be just as sensitive to the USSR as it is to the United States. Therefore, on an intelligence basis, it might be desirable to retain the original wording.

SECRET

32. Agree with the suggested inclusion of examination of submarines but again why not include internal examination as well as external.

33. Concur.

34. Concur.

35. Concur.

36. JCS suggests deletion of the item on the basis of sensitivity. In lieu of the possible net gain to the United States, this should be considered carefully.

37. Same as 36.

38. Concur.

39. Same as 12.

40. Concur.

41. Concur.

42. Concur.

43. Concur.

44. Concur.

45. Concur.

46. Concur.

47. Concur.

48. Same as 7 as to the technical aspects. The wholesale deletion in the JCS Revision suggests complete negative approach in this one field and appears inconsistent with the positive theme of this inspection concept.

49. Concur.

50. The JCS Revision here that the access to budgets will be as mutually agreed on opens the door completely to the possibility of not agreeing on anything and it is believed that this approach is negative and the United States stands to gain more by access than does the USSR.

51. The JCS merely notes consistency as the reason for this change. However, it is for consistency with the JCS position with relation to nuclear energy establishments and if they are overruled otherwise on this subject, it should not be deleted. The insertion of naval base and Army base is acceptable but do not believe that shipyards should be deleted.

52. Concur.

53. Concur.

54. Same as 2.

55. Concur.

56. Concur.

57. Concur.

Note: In the JCS Revision in Annex B there is no 57 indicated although it is obvious that it refers to paragraph 2 b.

58. We disagree with the JCS suggestion here in that the basic paragraph 2 is attempting to explain what are the rights, privileges and immunities and 2 d. originally intended to explain the immunity to panel members, etc., from control, search, seizure, and the rest. In any event it is probable that this subparagraph should be rewritten in its entirety to assure the precise expressions of intent.

59. Concur.

60. We believe the JCS Revision accomplishes no change and that their reason for change is not explanatory of the change. Prefer original wording.

61. Concur.

62. Concur.

63. The JCS Revision deletes reference to use of codes and provides for reports in mutually agreed method. I believe the JCS suggestion is subject to the same criticism that they direct at the original wording in that it may prove controversial. Therefore it might be better to delete entirely.

64. Concur.

65. Concur.

SECRET

25X1C

66. It occurs to us that once the data concerned has been made available to [REDACTED] and the USSR, that from the United States standpoint there is no justification for classification in the accepted sense. Since it is available both to friendly and "unfriendly" countries, there seems to be no legal basis for classification in the United States sense and no necessity for it in the US sense. Therefore recommend deletion of this item.

67. Concur.

68. Concur.

69. Concur.

70. Concur.

71. Concur.